

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 25, 1902.

LEGENDS OF PALESTINE AND ARABIA.

Theology and Ethics of the Hebrews. By Archibald Duff, M.A., LL.D., B.D., Professor of Old Testament Theology, Yorkshire College, Bradford. Pp. xvii + 304. (London: John C. Nimmo, Ltd., 1902.)

Syria and Palestine. By Lewis Bayles Paton, Ph.D. With Five Maps. Pp. xxxvi + 302. (London: John C. Nimmo, Ltd., 1902.) Both in the "Semitic Series." Each 5s. net.

THE increasing number of popular books on early Semitic history and sociology marks the ever-widening interest taken in this branch of scientific research, especially as far as the results of modern Old Testament criticism are concerned. The writer of a popular handbook undertakes a serious responsibility; it is for him to weigh carefully the arguments for and against all important theories, and to set before the general reader a fair and unbiassed account of what he considers to be the certain and indubitable results of the labours of scholars. In all matters of Biblical criticism he must hold a middle course between the servile acceptance of traditional belief on the one hand, and a system of drastic and monotonous emendation on the other. Above all must he keep himself severely aloof from ephemeral hypotheses, for he is writing for the uncritical layman and not for the discriminating expert.

Dr. Duff's book on the theology and ethics of the Hebrews seems hardly to fulfil all the above requirements. The first section opens with the period of Hebrew history which begins with the fifteenth century B.C., and describes the Exodus from Egypt to Sinai. Then follows what is, to say the least of it, an unsatisfactory explanation of the episode of the Tables of the Law. According to Dr. Duff, "then or thereabouts two slabs were brought down from the heights. There were strange markings upon them, crystalline, fossil, or otherwise" (p. 9). Of the three possibilities, the last is certainly the most probable, as neither crystalline nor fossil markings are likely to be mistaken for writing, and as the mountain traditionally regarded as Sinai is of granite, it is hardly probable that fossils would be found there. However, Dr. Duff proceeds with his explanation: "There arose in time a sacred formula connected with this relic, whereby they called their god

" 'The Almighty Yahweh who sits
Throned upon the winged creatures.

"This seems to suggest that the seeming hieroglyphic figures on the slabs were fossils or else crystalline forms resembling winged creatures. Therefore the people called them 'Kroobs,' i.e. Griffins (Γρὺψ)." The connection of Dr. Duff's "Kroobs" (which in the traditional transliteration is *cherub*) with Γρὺψ, has been given up by the Oxford Hebrew Dictionary (Clarendon Press, 1892, p. 500). That such supposed fossil markings on granite could be mistaken for "hieroglyphic figures," or crystalline markings for "winged creatures" or "Kroobs," are

NO. 1717, VOL. 66]

explanations harder to understand than the difficulty which they are devised to solve.

Dr. Duff inclines to the opinion that the divine name, Yahweh, is a causative incipient from the root *hawwah*, i.e. the god who caused rain to fall and thereby brought life and all things into being (p. 11). This is certainly possible, and appears to be as good an explanation as the other plausible view that Yahweh is the Kal of *hawah* (= *hayah*), i.e. "He Who Is."

When Dr. Duff reaches the third part of his book, wherein he describes the teachings of the prophets, he stands on firmer ground, and appears to know his subject better. Naturally, he begins with the caustic utterances of Amos against the luxury of Israel, and his warnings of the Assyrian approach; and, with the exception of a passage of "fine writing" on the first page, his *résumé* of this prophet is a good one. In the chapter on Hosea, which follows, the author has apparently been unable to make up his mind about a theory which, if it were true, would profoundly modify our conception of early Arabian and Hebrew history. On p. 61 he says: "Events on the Upper Nile or in Arabian muḥur (*sic*) now left a southern prince So or Sewe (Sabako?) free to turn again to plots in the Asiatic direction"; but, in spite of this leaning towards the heresies of Dr. Winckler, the author inclines to the more usual view of the relations between Israel and Egypt at this time. He is certainly to be congratulated on not having gone over entirely to what on the face of it seems a possible theory, but which in reality has less in its favour than is at first sight apparent.

Taken as a whole, Dr. Duff's book will be found useful, and though the author's style is at times somewhat tedious, his matter has been well arranged, and the idea of the analysis of the "J" and "E" portions of the Old Testament at the end is an excellent one.

In the second of the two books under review Dr. Paton has endeavoured, as he says in his introduction, to "gather up the results of the most recent explorations, and combining them with the facts already known from the Bible and from other ancient sources, to present them in a clear and popular form." His book deals with the history of Palestine and its relations with Egypt and Mesopotamia from the earliest times down to Cyrus, and to this end the author has laid under contribution a large quantity of material both from Egyptian and Assyro-Babylonian sources, though apparently he has little first-hand knowledge of the original texts. A wider understanding of the languages of the peoples with which he deals would have prevented him from falling into certain errors that are to be found in his book. For instance, he has adopted the chronological system of Lehmann, and although he accepts Assurbanipal's dating for Kudurnankhundi, who invaded Babylonia 1635 years before Assurbanipal's time (p. 30), yet, apparently only on the ground of its extreme antiquity, he rejects Nabonidus's date for Naram-Sin, who is said by the former to have reigned 3200 years before (p. x.). Again, he seems unable wholly to accept the truth about the "Chedorlaomer" texts, and sums up his review of the facts with the words, "It still remains doubtful, therefore, whether Chedorlaomer is mentioned in the

Z

Babylonian monuments" (p. 34). Now, as the "Chedor-laomer" myth was long ago exploded by King ("Letters and Inscriptions of Hammurabi," vol. i. p. xxv.), there is no longer any question about this matter, at any rate so far as the tablets that have been discovered up to the present time show. Noticeable, also, is the translation of "Ya'aqob-el" and "Yoseph-el" as "Jacob-god" and "Joseph-god" (p. 42), which is misleading to the general reader, and almost seems to betray in the author an ignorance of the meaning of these names. Further, "Morian" is hardly likely to be the equivalent of the Sumerian MAR.TU (p. 16).

In this book we again meet with the "Arabian-Mušri" theory, though even its supporters do not seem to be very certain as to where they intend to fix the position of their hypothetical Mušri. Even in the two maps where it is marked the position assigned to it is not the same in the one as in the other, and it has therefore apparently been given what is known mathematically as a *locus* in which its position varies, at one time shifting perilously near the borders of the southern Musri, *i.e.* Egypt (pp. 157 and 200). Since this so-called "epoch-making" theory has now begun to be reproduced in popular works, it is but right that the arguments on which its supporters rely should be examined in detail.

In 1893¹ Dr. Winckler published a theory that in addition to the two countries called in the Assyrian inscriptions Mušri (Egypt and part of Northern Syria) there existed a third in Northern Arabia, and since then he has adduced a number of arguments in order to support this theory, both from the Assyrian and Hymyaritic inscriptions. Among German scholars it has received little encouragement, but in England Dr. Winckler has been fortunate in finding an eloquent and receptive advocate in Prof. Cheyne, who has given it his sanction in the "Encyclopædia Biblica."² Since a popular handbook has absorbed and given credence to what is considered by the majority of critics to be a doubtful question, to say the least of it, it will be as well to state Dr. Winckler's arguments *seriatim*, in order that we may see how far they bear out his case. They may be briefly enumerated as follows:—

(1) Tiglath Pileser III. appointed a certain Idibi'ilu to be *kīpu* over Mušri,³ and this Idibi'ilu is mentioned elsewhere in the inscriptions of the same king,⁴ where he is called "Idibi'ilu of Arubu" (*i.e.* Arabia). Hence, Dr. Winckler says that Musri cannot mean Egypt here, but is a country in Northern Arabia, apparently simply because Idibi'ilu was an Arab. Now there seems to be no reason for translating Mušri as anything else than Egypt, for the Assyrians at this period were pushing their dominions rapidly down through Palestine. Further, we are not told that Tiglath Pileser conquered Egypt, but only that he appointed an Arabian sheikh as *kīpu* (an officer whose duties were obviously to watch the marches), a most natural and proper person for this purpose. So the new Musri theory receives no support from the first hypothesis.

(2) Yamani,⁵ the leader of the revolt in Ashdod, flees

before the approach of Sargon *ana ite (mātu) Musuri ša paṭ (mātu) Meluhha*, *i.e.* to the side of Musuri which borders on Meluhha.¹

If Meluhha be "Sinai, Midian," as Dr. Winckler at first supposed,² there is no reason to assume that Mušuri is a country lying to the east of this district, for if Mušuri be translated "Egypt," such an identification entirely agrees with the Assyrian geographical description of the southern Mušri. Besides, the most natural route for Yamani, who was fleeing from Ashdod before the Assyrian army advancing through Palestine from the north, led straight into Egypt, and not into Arabia, directly across the enemy's line of advance.

(3) Dr. Winckler argues that the Pir'u (spelt with the determinative prefix of persons and not officials) mentioned in the Assyrian texts³ is not Pharaoh, as Schrader supposed, but the proper name of a sheikh of his North Arabian Musri, since he is once spoken of as *maliku*. But Pir'u is certainly called *šarru* in the same inscription, so this cannot be considered of any great importance. It was about this time that the Assyrians of the later Empire were coming into actual contact with the Southern Mušri. Tiglath Pileser III., who pressed as far as its borders, mentions no king by name, but Sargon speaks of its king as Pir'u, evidently understanding it as a proper name. Now, we have an exact parallel to this in the Old Testament, where the Hebrews first speak of the King of Egypt as Pharaoh, evidently understanding it as a proper name, but later mention him either by name (Shishak), or with the addition of the royal title (Pharaoh-Necho, Pharaoh-Hophra). Further, in the last of the three texts quoted below in note³, there is surely no doubt that Haziti is Gaza, Rapihi is Raphia, and Sib'i is So (= Sēwē); and, these being granted, there is little to be gained by inventing an Arabian Musuri, when "Egypt" is the obvious explanation of the name. From this third line of argument, therefore, the new theory obtains no support.

(4) In the account of Sennacherib's battle at Eltekeh,

¹ It is doubtful whether any such meaning as "included in" or "belonging to" can be safely attached here to *ša paṭ*. Dr. Winckler's additional examples carry no weight (footnote, AOF, i. 27); the first, "Aphek im gebiete der provinz Samaria," rests on a misreading of *Samerina* for *Samena* . . . , or much less probably *Samenu* This name was copied *Samena* . . . by Dr. Budge in his *Esarhaddon*, 1880, p. 119, in correction of W. A. I., iii. and TSBA, iv., but this correction is totally ignored by Winckler (*Untersuchungen*, 1890, p. 98), who repeats the old mistake *Samerina*, and apparently did not recognise it until his publication of *Musri, Meluhha, Ma'in* (1898, p. 8). Dr. Budge's translation, "Aphek, which borders on the country of Samena," still holds good, inasmuch as no suitable identification for Samena has been suggested (Winckler's later suggestion, *Shimeon*, being doubtful). Even if it were Samaria, the translation "On the borders of Samaria" would quite agree with the geographical position of Aphek. His second example is "Pillutu ša paṭ ilamti Tigl. 14 (i R 67)" (read "Pillutu ša paṭti ilamti Tigl. 14 (ii R 67)"). As we do not know the exact locality of Pillutu, it is impossible to base any theories on the meaning of *ša paṭ* here, for the city in question may have been on the border of Elam.

² *Altor. Forsch.*, i. 27. We shall refer to Dr. Winckler's later theory that Meluhha = Yaman further on.

³ *Musri, Meluhha, Ma'in*, 1898, p. 2. Cf. (a) "Philistia, Judah, Edom and Moab . . . had brought presents to Pir'u, king (*šar*) of Musri, a chief (*maliku*) who could not save them." (b) "Of Pir', king of Musuri, Samsi, queen of Aribbi It'amra of Saba'al, kings of the side of the sea and the desert . . . their tribute I received." (c) "Hanunu, king of Haziti, with Sib'i the tartan of Musuri to the city of Rapihi to battle came against me; their defeat I accomplished. Sib'i feared the clash of my weapons and fled away, and his place was no more seen. Hanunu, king of Haziti, in hand I captured. The tribute of Pir'u," &c.

¹ *Altorientalische Forschungen*, i. 24.

² *iii.* 316x.

³ *Annals*, i. 226, &c.; Winckler, *Altor. Forsch.*, i. 25.

⁴ *Annals*, i. 240.

⁵ Winckler, *Sargon*, Pr. I. 102; *Altor. Forsch.*, i. 27.

Dr. Winckler¹ considers the Mušur, which is here mentioned with Meluḥḥa as coming to the help of the Ekronites, to be the so-called North Arabian country, and not Egypt. But Egypt was the natural ally of Palestine, and there is no reason to suppose that the Mušur here mentioned is anything else but Egypt, especially as the scene of the battle was Eltekeh, which is either in or near Philistia.

(5) Dr. Winckler finds support for his Arabian Mušri² in a Himyaritic text (Glaser, 1155 = Halévy, 535) which mentions *Mšr*, *Ašr*, *‘ēbr nhrn*,³ and *Mdi*. *Ašr* is mentioned elsewhere in the Himyaritic inscriptions (Glaser, 1083). The former of these inscriptions was assigned by Hartmann⁴ to the year of the conquest of Egypt by Cambyses (525 B.C.), and there is little doubt that this dating is correct. *Mšr* undoubtedly refers to Egypt; *Mdi*, of which Dr. Winckler gives no explanation, is, as far as we can judge at present, Media; while the identification of *Ašr* is as yet uncertain. Hartmann has shown that the speculations of Hommel as to the possibility of this inscription dating back to the time of the eighteenth Egyptian dynasty (c. 1500 B.C.) are without foundation, and the same may be said for the theory promulgated by Dr. Winckler, according to whom this text gives a hint of the wars of the people of Ma’in (= Meluḥḥa) and its supposed northern dependency, his imaginary Mušri, against the Assyrians in Southern Palestine in the eighth century B.C.⁵ The explanation of Hartmann is entirely sufficient; and no proof of the existence of an Arabian Mušri can be found in the Minæan inscriptions. It may be noted that Dr. Winckler does not accept the obvious meaning of the term *‘ēbr nhrn*, “across the river,” i.e. in the eyes of the Arabs Persia, an explanation which entirely fits in with Hartmann’s chronological theory.

(6) Dr. Winckler, however, has finally brought forward evidence which, on the face of it, seems good. He maintains that the small fragment of Assyrian tablet 83.1-18, 836 (which mentions Esarhaddon) proves the existence of Mušri as distinct from Mišri, i.e. Egypt. It “wird durch seine nebeneinandernennung von Mušri und Mišri d.h. von unserem Musri und Ägypten,” he says, “ja wol wenigstens die auseinanderhaltung beider länder von nun an bewirken,”

and he has attached such importance to it that he has published it in full.⁶ Unfortunately, besides one or two other bad blunders⁷ in a small text of six fragmentary lines, he has misread the one sign which was of importance to his theory.

In the fourth line Dr. Winckler reads, . . . mā[ti] Mu-uš-ri u mātu Mi-iš-[ri] . . . , thus proving to his own satisfaction that Mušri and Mišri were two distinct countries. But the *iš* in Mi-iš-[ri] ends at the break in the clay, and even from the very slight traces that remain, it is certain that the character is not *iš*. Taking into consideration the common conjunction of the country *Miluḥḥa* with Mušri, so well known to Assyriologists,

there can be no possible doubt that the sign was originally *luḥ*, and not *iš*, and the slight traces that remain (the traces of the top of another vertical wedge) make this hypothesis a certainty. Thus Dr. Winckler’s attempted proof of a mention in Assyrian literature of a Mušri side by side with Mišri (Egypt) falls to the ground.

Dr. Winckler has therefore furnished no proof whatever of the existence of a North Arabian Mušri, and until he does so, it is impossible to believe in the existence of a Mušri other than Egypt and the well-known country in Northern Syria.

Apart from these matters, Dr. Paton has evidently spent much time and trouble on his book, and although he has been influenced in too great a degree by the school of Hommel, his compilation will probably be found useful. Both Dr. Paton and Dr. Duff have added an excellent index to their books, and if only they had had a wider acquaintance with the languages of Assyria and Egypt, they would probably have been able to speak in less uncertain tones of the results obtained from the study of cuneiform and hieroglyphic texts.

R. C. T.

OUR BOOK SHELF.

The Elementary Principles of Chemistry. By A. V. E. Young. Pp. xiv + 252 + 106. (London: Hirschfeld Brothers, Ltd., 1902.) Price 5s. net.

THIS book, which is of American authorship, provides an elementary course of inorganic chemistry based upon the quantitative system. There is a theoretical part, an experimental part, and an appendix giving hints on manipulation. The student is to perform the experiments, make notes, and then to turn to the theoretical part for fuller information on the topic of his experiments, the teacher supervising each portion of the work.

The author expresses the hope that his book will contribute “to making practicable and serviceable that which he enthusiastically believes is both scientifically and pedagogically an improvement on the older and still largely prevailing method.” An examination of the book leads to the belief that this hope will be fulfilled, for there can be no doubt that the author is imbued with real educational zeal, and that he has bestowed much care and thought upon the arrangement of an excellent sequence of experiments illustrative of the main principles of chemistry.

A. S.

P.O.P. (The Use of Silver Printing-out Papers). By A. Horsley Hinton. Pp. 134. (London: Hazell, Watson and Viney, Ltd., 1902.) Price 1s. net.

SILVER printing-out papers are now so extensively used that a small volume like this cannot fail to be useful to a large number of those who practise photography. There is nothing particularly original in it, but a practical and successful photographer like the author cannot set down a series of instructions without giving many a useful hint. Current photographic literature and manufacturers’ “instructions” furnish an almost endless variety of formulae for the treatment of printing-out papers; it will therefore be distinctly advantageous to those whose experience of such papers is not large to have a small collection of selected formulae such as is here given. The illustrations that show the extent of over printing necessary to compensate for the loss by toning and fixing, and the kind of negative best suited for these processes, will be very welcome to the beginner. It would have been but little trouble to provide an index, the advantage of which in a book of practical instructions it is not necessary to point out.

¹ *Altor. Forsch.*, i. 27.

² *Musri, Meluḥḥa, Ma’in*, p. 20.

³ = ‘ēber ha-nahar (Winckler) [? hannahar].

⁴ *Zeits. für Assyriol.*, xi., 32.

⁵ *Musri, Meluḥḥa, Ma’in*, 18.

⁶ *Musri, Meluḥḥa, Ma’in*, p. 2.

⁷ For *pa-na* read [DINGIR].ALAD (l. 3), and add a determinative prefix to the proper name in l. 5. Read *ina lib-bi* after *ša* in l. 3.